

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This document relates to issues raised in the examiner's office action mailed December 11, 2007. In that office action, claims 1-32 were rejected by the examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103. Primary references used by the examiner in rejecting the claims are Burak et al. (US 2003/0176214), Miyazawa (US 6,954,223), and Berkel (Characterization & Optimization of 3D-LCD Module Design).

During a telephonic interview between the undersigned attorney and the examiner on May 7, 2008, the various rejections of the claims were discussed with respect to the present invention and the cited prior art references. A summary of the telephonic interview is presented below. At the conclusion of the telephonic interview, it was agreed that Figure 17A and 17B of Burak (and corresponding description in specification of Burak) relate to a parallax illumination display techniques, and do not relate to autostereoscopic display techniques which utilizes the use of lenticular lenses or lenticular displays..

Claims 1-32 have been cancelled from the application, and new claims 33-67 have been substituted therefore. No new matter has been added. It is to be noted that claims 1-32 have not been canceled for purposes relating to patentability. Rather, claims 33-67 are being substituted for claims 1-32 for purposes of clarification, and in order to present to the examiner a clean set of claims which reflect all of the presently presented claim features.

It is believed that new claims 33-67 are neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited prior art reference of record, and are therefore believed to be allowable. Additionally, for at least the reasons stated below, applicant respectfully traverses the examiner's rejections of the previously pending claims as set forth in the examiner's office action mailed December 11, 2007.

For example, in the examiner's office action mailed December 11, 2007, claims 1-12 and 14-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Burak et al. (US 2003/0176214) in view of Berkel and Clarke (Characterization & Optimization of 3D-LCD Module Design) (hereinafter called "Berkel"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, the examiner asserts that the elements of the presently claimed invention are disclosed in Burak except that "Burak fails to mention the number of perspective views that are achieved by the disclosure lenticular lens." The Office Action further contends that

Berkel teaches “the methodology for creating lenticular displays of higher than four perceptive views as an attempt to minimize the ‘blur’ between views and an increase between a horizontal and vertical resolution in each view” and that Berkel “illustrates to one having ordinary skill how to create a nine perspective view lenticular display.” The Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the reasons set forth below.

Burak teaches “a gaming machine having a persistence-of-vision (“POV”) display” to create true or virtual 3D imagery. (Paragraphs [0002]). Moreover, Burak teaches that cylindrical lenslets create a horizontal parallax effect only. Another type of lenticular display, also called an integram, uses spherical lenslets instead of cylindrical ones to present horizontally and vertically varying directional information, thus producing a full parallax image. (Paragraph [0132]). Thus, Burak teaches the use of spherical lenslets, rather than cylindrical lenslets, in order to create the 360° 3D image as the use of cylindrical lenslets would simply produce horizontal parallax effect only.

Berkel and Miyazawa teach methodologies of creating lenticular displays of higher than 4 perceptive views with the use of a lenticular lens. However, even assuming (for purposes of argument) that one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify the teachings of Burak to display the multi-perceptive images (of higher than 4 perceptive views) as taught in Berkel and/or Miyazawa, it is believed that the resulting modified display would be implemented using spherical-shaped lenslets (rather than cylindrical-shaped lenslets) in accordance with Burak’s preference for using spherical lenslets to allow for the presentation of both horizontally and vertically varying directional information to create Burak’s desired 3D image.

In contrast, as recited, for example, in at least some claimed embodiments of the present application, a gaming machine display screen is provided which may include a lenticular screen coupled with said display screen, wherein said lenticular screen is configured to facilitate presentation of nine perspective views that include a combination of three horizontal perspective views and three vertical perspective views, and wherein the lenticular screen comprises a plurality of cylindrical-shaped lenticules.

Additionally it is believed that none of the cited prior references of record teach or suggest the specific features of the claimed embodiments for generating and/or displaying nine perspective views that include a combination of three horizontal perspective views and three vertical perspective views. In at least one embodiment described in the specification of the present application, the selection of a format which includes nine perspective views comprising a combination of three horizontal perspective views and three vertical perspective

views, represents one preferred embodiment which provides, for example, the benefit of achieving specifically desired display properties of images displayed at the gaming machine display. For example, as described in the specification, page 11, for example, "nine perspective views may be preferable to maintain the aspect ratio of the image and provide sufficient perception of the object in three-dimensions from various angles. Fewer than nine perspective views may lessen the overall angle of view."

Additionally it is believed that none of the cited prior references of record teach or suggest, for example, the feature of selecting a desired pixel mapping algorithm (e.g., for use in generating pixel mapping information) using information relating to the number N of perspective views of the image to be displayed. For example, in at least one claimed embodiment the selected pixel mapping algorithm may correspond to a first pixel mapping algorithm if a value of N corresponds to a first value, whereas the selected pixel mapping algorithm may correspond to a second pixel mapping algorithm (different from the first pixel mapping algorithm) if the value of N corresponds to a second value which is different from the first value.

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record.

Because claims 33-67 are believed to be allowable in their present form, many of the examiner's rejections in the Office Action have not been addressed in this response. However, applicant respectfully reserves the right to respond to one or more of the examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
WEAVER AUSTIN VILLENEUVE & SAMPSON LLP

/Dean E. Wolf/

Dean E. Wolf
Reg. No. 37,260

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100